DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 883 HE 003 138

AUTHOR Pfnister, Allan O.
TITLE General Evaluation of Study Abroad Programs Under the Auspices [of] American Colleges and Universities.
INSTITUTION Denver Univ., Colo.
PUB DATE 3 May 72
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Atlanta, May 3, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Evaluation Methods; *Foreign Countries; *Higher Education; *International Education; *Program Evaluation; *Study Abroad

ABSTRACT

Study abroad programs have become more and more widespread over the past several years, and presently 25,000 students are involved in some kind of foreign study program for which academic credit may be earned. Critics of foreign study programs feel that the movement for international and intercultural education has expanded too quickly and without proper guidance and supervision. They further feel that intensive evaluation of existing programs is the only way to ascertain that the programs are beneficial to those they serve. Such an evaluation program would become costly if financial and manpower resources are not pooled. Thus, a cooperative venture of several regional accrediting associations is suggested as a means of study abroad program evaluation. Such a venture would not be looking at the programs as a separate institution to be accredited, but rather as a program within an institution with regard to its management, its effectiveness, and its necessity. (HS)

ED 063883

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

GENERAL EVALUATION OF STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS UNDER THE AUSPICES AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

by
Allan O. Pfnister
Professor of Higher Education
University of Denver

Sanders and Ward in the Carnegie Commission publication, Bridges to Understanding [Irwin T. Sanders and Jennifer C. Ward, Bridges to Understanding: International Programs of American Colleges and Universities, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970] observe that "Of all the international offerings in United States colleges and universities, study-abroad programs are the most visible, numerous and highly publicized." (p. 73) While this is probably an accurate statement, it is also at first reading a surprising statement. Considered only in terms of number of participants, study abroad would not seem overly impressive. In 1970 enrollment in American higher educational institutions totaled well over 8 million. It is estimated that somewhat over 25,000 American students were studying abroad. This means that American students abroad constituted little more than .03 of one per cent of enrollment in higher education. Even in comparison to the number of foreign students in the United States (estimated at over 135,000), the number of American students abroad is again unimpressive. [Estimates of the number of American students abroad and of foreign students in the United States are from recent issues of Open Doors, an annual publication of the Institute of International Education.]

On the other hand, 25,000 students represents one quite large and complex university or several smaller complex universities. And it seems clear, even to IIE, that the figures given for the overseas enrollments underestimate the total involvement of American colleges and universities.

HE 003 138

Moreover, it is anticipated, even in a period of financial stringency, that both the number of students in overseas study and the number of different programs available will continue to increase. Further, even though the total number of students participating in study abroad will remain a small portion of the total enrollment, we seem to be moving toward a point at which most American four-year colleges and universities will be involved in some form of study abroad program.

There is little need to document in detail for a group of this sort this rapidity with which these programs have developed, but let me remind you of the broad outlines of this development. Stephen Freeman observed in the 1966 edition of Undergraduate Study Abroad [Institute of International Education, Undergraduate Study Abroad: U.S. College-Sponsored Programs, New York: Institute of International Education, 1966] that the significant development in study abroad programs began in the late 1950's. Until 1950, there were only half a dozen junior year abroad programs. By 1956 the number had risen to 22. In 1962-63 there were 103 college-sponsored programs, and by 1965-66 it was possible to identify 208 programs. By 1967-68 the Education and World Affairs survey of international programs revealed that 308 colleges and universities were sponsoring 636 study abroad programs.

Just in terms of developments in a single center, the development is impressive. One of the first American academic year programs established at the University of Madrid was undertaken by New York University in 1955. In the intervening years the Institute of Hispanic Culture has worked with scores of American colleges and universities and reports that there are now well over 30 established academic year programs in Madrid, nearly as

many short-term summer programs, and inquiries continue about the possibility of developing still more programs.

In reviewing the developments in Germany, D.E.R. George notes that according to one listing there were 38 American study abroad programs in Germany in 1967. Another survey of the same year listed 71 exchange programs. George suggests that both listing only suggest the level of activity because they cover a wide range of programs, some of which are recognized by host institutions and some of which are not. The disparity in structure, intent, size and nature of American programs abroad makes any comprehensive survey exceedingly difficult. He notes that the head of the Freiburg Auslandamt reported 53 requests from different American schools within an 18 month period of time. [D.E.R. George, "The American Study Center in Germany," Comparative Education Review, III (February, 1969), 104-118]

The basic problem is not so much the sheer number of students involved so much as the rapidity with which programs are being developed. Allan A. Michie warns that American study abroad, both academic year and summer, has "proliferated so rapidly in recent years that it has created the impression of an uncontrolled, uncoordinated and ill-prepared movement." [Allan A. Michie, Higher Education and World Affairs, New York: Education and World Affairs, 1968, p. 22] He says that the quality of many of the programs is under question and that the growth is at best haphazard. In a report of his visit to 23 cities in which study abroad programs were located, Edward Durnall concluded that many U.S. institutions have embarked upon study abroad programs "without careful planning, administrative and faculty support, and continuing evaluation which are necessary to achieve excellence." [Edward J. Durnall, "Study Abroad Programs: A Critical Survey,"

Journal of Higher Education, 38 (November, 1967), p. 453] He goes on to recommend that representatives of several regional accrediting agencies or some such group not only formulate criteria for study abroad programs but institute some type of visitation to the centers conducted by U.S. institutions.

Writing in The French Review on "Evaluating the Foreign-Study Program," Theodore H. Rupp also calls attention to the "relatively sudden proliferation of all types of organized study abroad programs." [Theodore H. Rupp, "Evaluating the Foreign-Study Program," The French Review, XL (December 1965), 400-410.] He goes on to note:

> This growth, stimulated by well-intentioned educators as well as by profit motivated travel agencies, has been largely uncontrolled. The result has been a small minority of good programs and, in the absence of any accrediting agency, a large number of shoddy ones, whose chief requirement for admission appears to be the ability to pay the cost. (p. 400)

He then asks for the development of some type of accrediting procedure, in the absence of which he himself proposes a series of questions which ought to be raised by any person interested in evaluating an undergraduate foreign study program.

Not only have individuals become concerned about the quality of study abroad programs, but a number of national agencies have raised serious questions. In 1965 the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Supervisors of Foreign Languages appointed a study committee to review the status of study and travel abroad offered to high school students. It discovered so many problems attending these programs that it proceeded to develop a set of criteria for evaluating foreign study programs. In 1968 the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages adopted the same set of criteria for evaluating foreign study programs for high school

students. ["Criteria for Evaluating Foreign Study Programs for High School Students," Foreign Language Annals, I (May, 1968), pp. 288-290]

In 1965 the Council on Student Travel, now the Council on International Educational Exchange, published A Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programs Abroad. The publication of the Guide was prompted by the concern of the member institutions about the manner in which some programs were being developed.

> Since 1958, there has been a rapid growth in the number of programs set up overseas by colleges and universities for explicit academic purposes. This has alerted educators to the need for overseas academic programs to compare in quality with academic programs within their own borders. In part, the concern of educators has been that the educational experiences of American students abroad should be sufficiently organized to offer the maximum educational advantages.... There have also been serious misgivings about well-meaning persons or institutions that organize educational trips to foreign countries--in such a way that participants learn little about those countries and utterly fail to develop such understanding of the difference between a foreign culture and their own culture as can be attained through the right kind of foreign experience. [Council on Student Travel, A Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programs Abroad, New York: CST, 1965, p. 2]

The Committee on Academic Programs Abroad of the Council headed the development of the Guide and drew on the experience of nearly 100 persons representing more than 70 educational institutions and organizations.

The problem had become sufficiently acute to prompt a federal agency to issue a word of caution to persons contemplating participation in a study abroad program. The Burea of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State reports that it has received many complaints from individuals, ranging all the way from those finding themselves stranded in a foreign country to those paying fees far exceeding the values of the services performed. In its pamphlet the Bureau suggests a series of questions that one should raise regarding the nature of the organization, the fees

charged, the circumstances under which refunds are possible, the location of the office, purpose of the sponsoring agency, etc. ["Student, Teachers, Counselors--A Word of Caution: Private Work, Study or Travel Abroad Organizations," Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, n.d.]

The Federation of Regional Commissions of Higher Education undertook a limited review to determine the extent of the involvement of member higher institutions in overseas programs. The survey, completed in 1966-67, was admittedly of a limited nature, but it revealed that among the 93 institutions reporting academic year abroad programs there were more than 4,000 students involved. As a consequence of that survey the Federation adopted in March 1967 a statement of policy on study abroad programs ["Policy Statement on Undergraduate Study Abroad Programs," Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education, 1967]. With its adoption by the Federation it became part of the policy and procedures of the individual regional associations. The statement begins with the following words:

> Study abroad is increasingly accepted as an important phase of many undergraduate programs in American colleges and universities. Carefully planned and administered, opportunities for foreign study can add significant dimensions to a student's educational experience. At the same time, the great diversity of programs poses serious problems for evaluation and control.

The statement then lists ten guidelines for the evaluation of study abroad programs.

But even with the existence of policy statements and guides, it appears that American colleges and universities are proceeding in the establishment of their own programs in large part failing to take into account the experiences of other institutions--or refusing to take into

account such experiences. Limited use appears to be made of the CST Guide, and few institutions seem to be aware of the existence of the Federation policy statement. It appears that nothing short of some type of site visit such as that suggested by Durnall or Rupp will suffice to call attention to the need for some kind of quality control. In apparent response to this need several developments seem to be underway almost simultaneously:

(1) A group of study directors in Spain have organized for the purpose of establishing among themselves some standards for the recognition of study programs. What has become the Regional Board of American Programs in Spain has undertaken team evaluation of 7 institutions in late 1971 and has made additional evaluations during the early months of 1972.

(2) The directors of American study abroad programs in Germany have developed a similar organization. The Standing Committee of the Directors Conference of American Study Programs in Germany has published a list of "American academic programs accredited at German universities." (3) The Council on International Educational Exchange has experimented with a cooperative evaluation project in sponsoring a team visitation to several centers in France during the spring of 1972. (4) The Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education is sending a team to France and Spain in May, 1972.

Let me review two of the developments as a way of illustrating more specifically some of the issues involved in the general evaluation of American programs abroad. First of all, may I turn to the development of the Regional Conference of American Programs in Spain. [Much of the material on the Regional Conference is drawn from a more lengthy report published as an Occasional Paper in Higher Education at the University of

Denver--The Evaluation of Overseas Study Programs: Two Case Studies--Central America and Spain.]

The impetus for the establishment of the Regional Board came out of a conference called in January, 1968 by the Institute of Hispanic Culture in Madrid. The Institute arranged for a conference of directors of American programs in Spain to facilitate the exchange of information on current activities, problems and solutions. The conference, held in Puerto de la Cruz, Tenerife, included in addition to the study directors a representative from the Cultural Affairs Office of the U.S. Embassy in Spain, representatives from the Institute and from the Spanish universities. One of the outcomes of the meeting was the appointment of several committees charged to explore further problem areas which had been identified during t he conference.

In February 1969, again under the auspices of the Institute, the American study directors met to review developments growing out of the previous year's meeting. A committee memorandum called attention to the "proliferation of American foreign programs in Spain, not in regard to numbers but in regard to low quality which jeopardizes our standing at home, and in the eyes of the Spanish universities." ["Memorandum on the Conference of American Programs submitted by the Committee to the Conference of American Programs in Spain," February, 1969] The memorandum also stated that there were no "standards of acceptable academic level in foreign programs" and that it should be the intention of the organization to "develop a system of self-imposed evaluation and discipline which will indicate approval of the majority of substantial programs, which will offer creditable work and to withhold approval from those who do not."

The memorandum called for the establishment of some form of evaluation and accreditation procedure.

The Committee of Program Directors had identified the problem, namely the apparent lack of quality control among overseas programs. In the absence of any other form of on-site evaluation on the part of any American agency, the Committee was proposing that the study directors themselves establish an organization that would be able to develop criteria and that would be able to apply these criteria to existing programs. Subsequent meetings of the group were held in April and October, 1969. The criteria first proposed at the April meeting were revised somewhat in October. One of the reports presented at the October meeting observed that the U.S. regional accrediting agencies were probably not sufficiently familiar with foreign universities in American programs abroad to be able to examine such programs and that the development of the Conference Board was probably the best solution.

During the Fourth Conference of American Academic Programs at Palma de Majorca the accreditation of study abroad programs became an issue for discussion during several sessions. The meetings at Palma included representatives from study programs throughout Europe. Questions such as the following were raised: (1) whether it was appropriate for an independent group of study directors to establish what appeared to be another set of accrediting procedures; (2) whether the American sponsoring institutions had been sufficiently involved in discussions leading to the establishment of the Conference Board; (3) how regional accrediting agencies might be involved in further discussion. The consensus of the discussions appeared to be that the proper control of overseas study programs should be

through the established U.S. regional accrediting agencies and in the course of the membership review of individual colleges and universities. It was pointed out, however, that on the basis of the present structure, the regional agencies might be inclined to do little more than call attention in passing to organization and structure of overseas study in terms of the overall activities of an institution.

In January 1971 there was further discussion within the Regional Conference Board during which the point was made that the Board did not intend to become an accrediting agency, but it did want to call attention to the necessity for maintaining some kind of review of academic standards among study abroad programs.

In May 1971 a revised organizational plan was reviewed by the Conference Board and plans were made for beginning a series of evaluations. It was agreed that ten programs in Madrid would be evaluated. The point was again made that the emphasis should be placed upon evaluation as distinct from general accreditation. By November 1971 several of the evaluations had been completed, and seven institutions were formally approved for membership in the Regional Conference. In the meantime the Conference Board issued a summary statement on the history of its activities and called attention to the fact that its purpose was:

> to include only evaluation and dissemination of information on American programs in Spain. The main objective of the Board is, thus, to collect extensive information on all programs who have become participants...to assist in evaluation of such programs following published criteria; to assist established programs to live up to their stated goals in both academic and extra-curricular aspects of the program, with the hope that shortcomings may be avoided or quickly corrected by the local director of the sponsoring institution. In cases where a program is not sponsored by an American university or college, the Conference Board will deliberate steps to be taken to aid in correcting such shortcomings as exist. ["Brief History of the Regional Conference of American Programs in Spain, Madrid, March 10, 1971]

The statement went on to note that some 27 institutions were participating in the Conference as of March 1971, that the organization was completely voluntary, that a continuing attempt would be made to contact new programs as well as those who have existed for some time but have not yet participated in the work of the Board.

It is not my purpose to debate the extent to which the Conference Board viewed itself as an accrediting agency during its early development or to question whether the Conference Board should have viewed itself as an accrediting agency. The essential point is that in the view of some 20 directors of American study programs in Spain evaluation of study abroad was important enough to merit the development of a new organization. Both out of concern for the integrity of their own programs and out of convictions that some of the programs being established lack sufficient concern for quality, the directors responsible proceeded to establish an organization that would help to clarify matters. At least, to those directors, while presumably the American sponsoring institutions were aware of the development in their programs and concerned with the maintenance of quality, as a matter of record the study abroad programs did not maintain the quality that should have been expected at the home institutions. The study directors were echoing the concerns of Durnall, when he stated that in spite of the fact that one might have expected that study abroad programs would "voluntarily examine their programs in the light of commonly accepted standards," the fact of the matter was that such was not happening and some additional means were needed to maintain quality.

I turn now to the part played by the U.S. regional accrediting agencies. Several writers have pointed to the need for involving regional accrediting agencies in evaluating overseas work. And the question may be

raised as to why regional accrediting agencies have not as yet become more widely involved in the accreditation of overseas programs. Only three of the seven higher commissions have had experience in evaluating programs outside of the United States. The Southern Association has evaluated collegiate programs in Mexico. The Middle States Association has been involved in the evaluation of a candidate institution in Paris, the American School in Paris. The North Central Association gave preliminary status to a program jointly operated by one of its member institutions and an institute in Paris. The only additional overseas evaluations have been made by the secondary commission of the North Central Association and the Secondary Commission of the Southern Association. The Commission on Secondary Schools of the North Central Association has had extensive experience in evaluating dependent schools in Europe and elsewhere. These are schools established by the Armed Services of the United States for the education of dependents of American personnel stationed overseas. The Secondary Commission of the Southern Association has evaluated schools in Latin America.

One of the basic deterrents to greater involvement on the part of the regional accrediting agencies has been that of priorities. Although the number of students participating in overseas study has increased significantly in recent years, the number in relation to the total enrollment in American higher education is, as I have already pointed out, quite small. The regional agencies, facing many demands at this time, have questioned whether the number of students in study abroad is large enough to call for the development of special programs of evaluation. Viewed in terms of relative numbers involved, special evaluation of overseas study programs probably would not be high among the priorities of the regional agencies.

For any given American institution, with some few exceptions, overseas study probably represents a very small portion of its total program.

Yet there are other considerations. The pressures of American study programs in a single overseas location presents a special problem. Consider, for example, Madrid. There are well over 1,000 American students concentrated in Madrid on a year-round basis. With summer programs, short-term, study tour, and other variations, the total American student population in Madrid could be over 2,000. There is a great variety of programs in Madrid, a wide range of institutional arrangements. While the number of students in any one program is not large, taken together, enrollment in American study abroad in Madrid represents a sizeable population. It is a hodge-podge kind of development, and if, as is likely, it continues in this way, it may make more difficult the establishment of new programs or relating in an intelligent way to existing programs. Some effort should be made to assess the various developments and provide authoritative information on what is happening.

As I have already noted, the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education, responded at first in a general way by undertaking a survey of the involvement of American colleges in study abroad programs in 1967. It was out of that survey that the "Policy Statement on Undergraduate Study Abroad Programs" was developed. The Federation at that point, however, did not suggest the need for separate evaluation of such programs; any evaluation was to be part of a general institutional evaluation.

The Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education was established in 1964. It is an organization of the higher

education commissions of the six regional association. It grew out of a series of informal conferences of executive secretaries of the regional associations. Since its establishment, it has adopted a number of general statements on the nature and function of accreditation, including a statement on undergraduate study abroad programs and the accreditation of American programs outside of the United States. On the basis of a study of the six regional associations sponsored by the Federation, the Federation itself is currently involved in developing a new structure that will center more authority and direction in a central and national office.

The Federation interest in the problem of evaluation of study abroad programs was further prompted by two reports based upon visits I made to Spain in January 1970 and in September 1970. The regional accrediting agencies were concerned about the quality of study abroad programs sponsored by their member institutions. This concern seemed a logical extension of the stated concern over the developments in off-campus work in general. The problem was one of how to approach the evaluation of overseas locations.

In 1966 the Federation had adopted a "Policy Statement on Code of Good Practice in Accrediting in Higher Education." The Code called attention to the general stance that an accrediting agency should take toward any type of evaluation. In accordance with the Code, an accrediting agency agrees that it will evaluate or visit an institution only on the invitation of the chief administrative officer; that it recognizes the right of the institution to be evaluated in the light of its stated purposes; that it respects institutional freedom; that it reviews the program or programs of study in the light of the institution's overall goals; that it seeks to assist and stimulate improvement of educational effectiveness; encourages sound educational experimentation and permits innovation; that it regard

the evaluation reports as a confidential matter between the institution and the accrediting agency; and that it provide a means of appeal or reconsideration after an accrediting decision. There are other provisions in the Code, but the above will provide some sense of the orientation of the Federation. The emphasis upon the voluntary aspect of accreditation emerges quite clearly.

In the light of its own Code, the Federation is clearly committed to maintaining the confidential relationship between the individual institutions and the regional agency. It is also committed to viewing any accreditation as part of an overall assessment of the institution in terms of the institution's own goals and purposes. Effectively, any evaluation of study abroad programs should be considered in the light of the general purposes of the sponsoring institution, and evaluation should be in terms of the overall assessment of the sponsoring institution. Overseas study should be evaluated as a separate program only if it may be viewed by the sponsoring institution and the accrediting agency as a separately organized relatively autonomous off-campus program.

Yet, if a regional accrediting agency were to attempt to evaluate study abroad programs institution by institution as the Code would suggest, it would fact a logistically and economically impossible task. Small undergraduate institutions may maintain overseas programs in three or four locations, no one of which may have more than five to ten students. Even the larger university sponsored programs seldom reach a size of two hundred students. To undertake an evaluation of the study abroad programs for a medium-sized university of 10,000, for example, would involve on-site visits to five or six different locations in Europe and perhaps Asia, and all told, perhaps no more than 100 to 200 students would be involved.

It was in the light of these considerations that I proposed a pilot evaluation which would be on an inter-regional basis. The proposal included the following features:

1. Such an evaluation would be inter-regional, i.e., it should be a cooperative venture of several regional associations, rather than the effort of an individual regional association. To use Madrid as an example, there are well over 1,000 American students in some type of academic program in Madrid. With the exception of three or four programs, the total number of students from any one institution hardly merits a site evaluation by a single agency. However, the six regions cooperating in a single pilot evaluation could examine the programs of institutions from several regions and provide feedback for the individual institutions and the regions' secretaries.

2. Any site evaluation undertaken should not be viewed as a second accreditation. The programs are maintained by institutions already regionally accredited. What the site evaluation should do is to provide some insight into such matters as: the special problems of overseas programs, the quality of programs now underway, some insight into situations which can and ought to be avoided. Such information can then be referred to the home institutions, and at the time of the periodic review of any institution in any one of the six accrediting agencies, the information on the overseas program should be made a part of the data of review visit. Several recommendations might develop out of the site visit: (a) the program might be viewed as a strong part of the home institution's educational program, and it should be continued; (2) some questions may be raised about the management of the program, and these questions should be relayed to the home institution; (c) enough concerns might be raised to cause the evaluators

to suggest to the home institution that it drop the program, or change it significantly; the evaluators might on the basis of the overseas program call into question the general planning efforts of the home institution.

3. However the evaluation is undertaken, the study abroad program should not be treated separately or independently of the regular contacts the regional associations have with their member institutions.

4. Develop a small team representing several of the regions. If the pilot project is in Spain, include on the team some members in the field of Spanish literature and language. The team should not, however, be dominated by professionals in the field of language and literature, since the goals of the program may be much wider; it should represent persons with general evaluation competencies as well.

5. Ask each of five or six programs agreeing to participate in the pilot study to undertake a form of self-study and prepare a written report for the Federation. This self-study might follow somewhat the outline of the questions raised by the study directors in Spain and could be related to the criteria on undergraduate study programs abroad developed by the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education in April, 1967. There should be a 10-15 page document that provides specific information regarding the purpose of the program, a description of the administrative relationships, a roster of personnel involved, some statement regarding self-evaluation and some insight into the way in which the home institution maintains a connection with the study program.

6. Plan to have the team spend approximately one week in Madrid. One or two members might make one-day trips to Seville and/or Barcelona. The team could undertake the general evaluation of the administrative

arrangements, assess the student response, attempt to determine the special problems facing overseas programs such as those in Madrid and Spain.

The proposal as outlined above was considered in the course of several meetings of the Federation. In the spring of 1971 a committee was appointed to develop procedures for a pilot evaluation. In the course of its deliberations the Committee has modified somewhat the original proposal. [The committee consisted of: Gordon W. Sweet, Executive Secretary of the Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (chairman); Kay J. Andersen, Executive Director of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, Western Association of Schools and Colleges; Allan O. Pfnister, Professor of Higher Education, The University of Denver.] The subcommittee developed a ten-page set of guidelines for a self-study to be completed by each of the institutions participating in the pilot study. The guidelines call for a brief description of all study abroad programs undertaken by the institution, and detailed description of the programs in the sites to be visited. Within the detailed descriptions, the institution is asked to provide a statement on purposes and objectives and information on the general administration of the program, procedures for admission and orientation, curricular structure, procedures for evaluation, staffing, facilities, relationships with the host country and institutions, procedures for overall program evaluation and change. The institution is then asked to summarize the major strengths and weaknesses of the program and to indicate what appear to be the special advantages accruing to students who participate in the program: What values does the student receive that he would not be able to obtain on the home campus? What mechanism exists for securing student evaluation of the program?

It was decided that nine programs will be evaluated in Madrid and two in Strasbourg. The two locations were selected for purposes of comparison and contrast. One of the institutions with a major program in Madrid also maintains a substantial program in Strasbourg. The other institution in Strasbourg serves as an agent for several colleges, although it does not have also a program in Madrid. The major portion of the time will be spent in Madrid. A team of five, plus the executive secretaries of two of the regional accrediting associations will spend two weeks in May in Europe to carry out the evaluation. A portion of the team will spend two days in Strasbourg, then join the remainder of the team in Madrid for a two-week study of the nine programs there.

Each of the colleges or universities being reviewed has responded to the guidelines. The self-study materials provided will be the basis for the on-site evaluation. While on-site, members of the team will interview the study directors, French and Spanish faculty teaching courses for the American college students, administrators of programs for foreigners at the University of Strasbourg and the University of Madrid, and a large number of students. Visits will also be made to the locations where classes are held.

Among the nine programs in Madrid, there are at least five different operating arrangements. A number of programs are housed at the Instituto de Cultura Hispanica. At the Instituto they maintain both office and classroom space. These institutions individually arrange with Spanish faculty for teaching their courses. Some of the faculty are related to the University, others may be government officials, independent artists, or private citizens.

Another group of institutions maintains offices and classrooms at the Instituto Internacional en Espana. Formerly a girls' school, it is now the location for several American study programs. The building at Miguel Angel 8, houses offices, classrooms and a library. It also maintains a limited cafeteria service. Some of the courses provided at the Instituto Internacional may be in English, as is the case for some courses offered at the Instituto de Cultura Hispanica.

A third group of institutions maintains offices and classes at the Facultad de Filosofia y Letras of the University of Madrid. Working as a consortium, the colleges arrange through an office of the Facultad that is responsible for programs for foreigners for such classes as they need for their students. The classes are especially arranged for the American students, but they are taught by members of the Facultad and in Spanish. In one sense the students are registered in the Facultad, but it is more proper to say that they are simply using facilities of the Facultad. The students have some opportunity, however, to meet Spanish students who are regularly enrolled at the University. Students taking courses at the Instituto de Cultura Hispanica, the Instituto Internacional en Espana and the Facultad de Filosofia y Letras are generally housed with Spanish families in the city of Madrid.

A fourth type of program is conducted in one of the collegios. Students live in collegios mayores and in private homes. A collegio mayor is a private residential unit, usually under a religious community, that resembles in some ways the idea of the British college. It provides a living, social, and recreational center. The collegios are located within the area of the University of Madrid that is called University City.

Still another of the programs to be evaluated in the pilot study has its office in a private structure, arranges for classes with individuals and operates more or less independently of the other programs.

I am sure that the five types of arrangements I have noted do not exhaust all of the possibilities. Indeed, one college not included in the pilot evaluation maintains an office only to keep in contact with doctoral students who are working on individual programs. The arrangements under this program obviously have to be made to fit the individual research programs of the students.

In the course of the pilot evaluation, we shall also attempt to gain further insight into the impact of the year abroad on the students. Most of the programs being evaluated are programs that continue through the academic year; a few are semester-long programs, but most of them follow the pattern of a junior year abroad. We shall want to find out something about the students' reaction not only to the structural aspects of the programs sponsored by the respective colleges but to living in a different culture and to the significance of the overall experience. Since the interviews will be at the end of the students' semester or year-long experience, this should be a good time for summing up.

During the latter part of the site visit, members of the team will begin preparing reports on individual institutions. Each member of the team will contribute to each of the reports, but individual members will be responsible for writing the reports on individual institutions. The reports, when completed, will be sent to the Executive Secretary of the regional association in which the institution is located. He will then transmit the report to president of the institution sponsoring the study abroad program. The report will also become a part of the institutional

data to be referred to in connection with the periodic membership review visits. Should the report suggest serious enough weaknesses in the study abroad program, a recommendation could be made that the periodic review visit be held at an earlier date or that some other form of immediate contact be made with the sponsoring institution.

In addition, a general summary will be presented to the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education. As I have already noted, this is a pilot study. We shall want to reflect upon the procedure itself and to determine whether there is a more effective way to proceed. We are faced with the necessity of carrying on ten separate evaluations within two weeks. Perhaps we have undertaken too large a project. Yet, because of the expense and time involved we can hardly proceed on the cooperative basis on the evaluation of study abroad programs unless we are able to include a good number of programs in a single location.

If the procedure seems to be feasible or if with some modifications it can be made more effective, we shall probably propose that subsequent visits be planned to other major centers. The next logical group of programs to be evaluated would be those located in France and/or Germany. We shall have some indication of the possibilities of using the same approach in France through our evaluation of two programs in Strasbourg.

At this point we are still convinced that the best approach to the evaluation of study abroad programs is through the regional accrediting agencies. Some have suggested that a specialized agency needs to be developed to examine study abroad programs as such, but at this point we seriously question whether this is the case. American colleges and universities are already faced with periodic evaluations by a large

number of independent accrediting agencies. Every effort is being made to reduce the number of specialized evaluations and to consolidate accreditation activity rather than to disperse it. A moderate-sized university such as, for example, the University of Denver, may find itself undergoing accreditation from a dozen or so different agencies. The expense of the individual evaluations, both in money and time, has become a matter of considerable concern. I am sure the University of Denver would not be prepared to welcome another specialized accrediting agency concerned with evaluation of study abroad programs as such. I could see, however, the University of Denver being responsive to any cooperative efforts that might be undertaken with and through regional accrediting agencies. That is to say, in the overall evaluation of the University of Denver by the North Central Association, there might be included a specialized examination of its study abroad programs--but such special evaluation should be part of the regional concerns and not an evaluation undertaken by a separate agency.

If the pilot project of the Federation of Regional Accrediting Agencies suggests that the particular approach now being undertaken is not feasible, then those concerned with maintaining quality among study abroad programs have little recourse but to develop their own approaches. That taken by member institutions of the Council for International Educational Exchange points to a possibility. On a mutually supporting basis, a number of institutions holding membership in CIEE have agreed to share costs of inviting an outside group of evaluators to review their respective study abroad programs. One such team of three persons recently returned from a review of programs in Bordeaux, Rennes, and Besancon. The institutions participating in this evaluation benefit from having a

team of three outsiders examine their programs. They are able to share expenses and subsequently to make use of the reports of the team members through personal visits.

One feature of the CIEE approach is that one or more members of the evaluation team that visited the overseas site will subsequently make a visit to the home campus. No such provisions is made under the FRACHE study, although at least the FRACHE team chairman will meet later in the year with the stateside directors of international education of the institutions reviewed during May. Whether this type of feedback is as effective as direct contact with officials on the home institution campus remains to be seen.

-0-

Paper presented on May 3, 1972 at meeting of National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Atlanta, Georgia.